



MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A. PATENT, TRADEMARK & COPYRIGHT ATTORNEYS

York Business Center, Suite 205 3209 West 76th Street Edina, MN 55435

Telephone (952)832.9090

Facsimile (952)832.9191

FROM: Mark A. Litman

GRUUP 3700

February 14, 2002

Time: 11:40 am. (Edina, Minn.CST)

Ms. Burnell Ross TO: Applicant:

Michael Martinek et al.

Serial No.: Filed:

09/520,405

March 8, 2000

Title:

COMPUTERIZED GAMING SYSTEM, METHOD AND APPARATUS

Facsimile Center For Group 3700

Washington, D.C. 20231

TELEPHONE: (703)362_1015

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

Docket: PA0390.ap.US

FAX NUMBER (703)36 812, 9302

Document(s) Transmitted: Two (2) pages of Correspondence

Total pages of this transmission, including THIS COVER SHEET: 3 pgs

If you do NOT receive all of the pages described above, please telephone us at 952.832.9090, or fax us at 952.832.9191.

THE EXAMINER IS RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE SPECIFIC RESPONSE, AND CALL THE ATTORNEY OF RECORD IF THERE ARE AND By: Man (especial)

QUESTIONS.

Name: Mark A. Litman

Reg. No.: Reg. No. 26,390

FEBRUARY 14, 2002

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Mark A. Litman

Date of Transmission

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Michael G. Martinek et al.

Examiner:

S. Ashburn

Serial No.

09/ 520,405

Group Art Unit:

3713

Filed:

March 8, 2000

Docket No.

PA0390.ap.US

Title:

COMPUTERIZED GAMING SYSTEM METHOD AND APPARATUS

COMMUNICATION RE: PAST AMENDMENT - COMPLIANCE WITH 37 CFR 1.121

Attn: MS. BURNELL ROSS

703.305.3599

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Ms. Ross:

This Correspondence is being filed in response to your telephone inquiry of February 14, 2002 regarding compliance of the Amendment dated December 18, 2001, which you indicated was received by your Group on January 23, 2002.

BASIS OF INQUIRY

In a telephone communication to this Office from Ms. Burnell Ross of the US Patent and Trademark Office, compliance of the Amendment was questioned with regard to 37 CFR 1.121. Specifically, it was stated that the IN THE CLAIMS section did not show hand-entered amendments to the claims, even though clean copies of the amended or new claims was provided at the end of the Amendment. Correction was required.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION

In the Office Action mailed on May 22, 2001, the U.S. PTO required Restriction and Election of Ultimate Species to be exercised between claims 1-47, all of the claims in the Application. Solely for the purpose of responding to the Office Action mailed on May 22, 2001 that requires Applicants to elect an ultimate species, Applicants elected, with traverse, the subject matter identified as Species I, a data processor operating system, to be examined on the merits. Claims 1-17, 19, 21-26, 28-37, 39-44 and 47. Applicants submitted additional claims 48-52 in response to that Office Action, and partially traversed the restriction requirement.

In the Office Action dated August 29, 2001, claims 1-51, all of the claims in the Application at that time, were examined and the restriction requirement withdrawn.